Minutes for CCAC Meeting
(Revised Agenda)

Date of Meeting: June 13, 2007
Name of Committee: CITY CENTER ADVISORY COMMISSION
Location: Red Rock Creek Conf. Room, 13125 SW Hall Blvd, Tigard
Minutes taken by: Doreen Laughlin, Administrative Specialist II
Called to order by: Chairman Carl Switzer
Time Started: 6:35pm
Time Ended: 9:50pm
Commissioners Present: Alice Ellis Gaut; Carolyn Barkley; Vice Chair Alexander Craghead; Ralph Hughes; Roger Potthoff; Suzanne Gallagher; Chairman Carl Switzer

Commissioners Absent: Lily Lilly

Others Present: Lisa Olson; Chuck O'Leary; and Brian Wegener of Tualatin Riverkeepers

Staff Present: Phil Nachbar, Senior Planner; Doreen Laughlin, City Admin Specialist II

<u>Agenda Item #1</u>: **Welcome and Introductions:**

Important Discussion and/or Comments: It was noted Chuck O'Leary and Brian Wegener were there to hear the discussion regarding Fanno Creek Park and Plaza Master Plan update.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): None

<u>Agenda Item #2</u>: **Review/Approve Minutes:**

Important Discussion and/or Comments: It was moved and seconded to approve the May 9th minutes.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): A vote was taken and the 5/9/07 minutes were approved unanimously.

Important Discussion and/or Comments: For clarification regarding minutes, Chair Switzer relayed a conversation he and Doreen Laughlin had recently in which it was noted the minutes are not meant to be a word for word transcription of all that was said. The audio

CCAC Meeting Minutes for June 13, 2007
Page 1 of 6

recording is exact and available to the public for review for a full year as an official record of the meetings. The minutes are more of an "action" type, they are meant to be an overview and a summarization of what was said. They are to help remind CCAC members of what was discussed at the meeting, and to accurately document all motions and votes. He noted there is not a need to "wordsmith" the minutes unless something of import, such as a motion or vote outcome, are obviously incorrect. The meetings are recorded, and the recordings are retained for a year and are available for review by CCAC or members of the general public at any time within that year.

Agenda Item #3: Public Comment Period (optional): There were no comments from the public.

Important Discussion and/or Comments: At this point Phil Nachbar noted there would be some changes to the meeting's agenda. [The revised agenda items are noted.]

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): None.

New Agenda Item #4: CCAC/Council input for development strategy.

Important Discussion and/or Comments: Nachbar presented a handout regarding the scope of services and deliverables. Some of the main thoughts were:

- July 10 Council workshop will include a session with Council and CCAC to discuss the Development Strategy being conducted by Leland Associates.
- It is an opportunity for the CCAC to provide their thoughts or concerns about the study, and have a dialogue with Council and staff.
- Although the goal of the study is to obtain an unbiased professional assessment of proposed land uses and a development strategy, July 10 workshop will inform Council and the CCAC about the approach taken and the goals of the study.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): None.

New Agenda Item #5: Report on trip to Vancouver. BC

Nachbar reported on a trip to Vancouver, BC that was taken by two members of Council and City staff recently:

Important Discussion and/or Comments:

- Councilors Sydney Sherwood and Nick Wilson, along with John Floyd, staff planner, went on a Metro sponsored trip to Vancouver, Canada.

- Council members returned very encouraged by a side trip to Port Moody, which was a small city similar in size and scale to Tigard. Members were impressed with:
  - the downtown area;
  - the 'village' concept;
  - the inclusion of employment and residential in the downtown; and
  - the 'look and feel' of the downtown area.
- The result was that Council recommended staff look into a trip to Port Moody in which key stakeholders in the downtown and the CCAC would be invited. A tentative date is July 26-27.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): A quick poll of interest was taken and 3-4 members were interested in attending. Nachbar will arrange, and get back to the CCAC to confirm if and when the trip will take place.

New Agenda Item #6: **Recognition of Contributions to Downtown**

Important Discussion and/or Comments:

Nachbar mentioned Community Development Director, Tom Coffee's, suggestion that perhaps the Commission consider a way to acknowledge contributions to the Downtown by business or property owners. He noted there have been several positive developments in the Downtown, and recognizing efforts in a more formal way may well foster a more positive, cooperative relationship among stakeholders, staff, the CCAC, and other relevant committees & commissions. There was discussion about the pros and cons of doing this. Some thought it would have to have clear guidelines to be fair, others thought it could be made more subjective. Some felt, as a way of public recognition, utilizing press releases would be a good idea - such as congratulating someone on opening a new business and that they're going to be a great addition to the community etc.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): No conclusion was made and the agenda item was referred to the next meeting for further discussion.

[*Due to public interest, original agenda items 5 and 6 were combined and taken out of order as:*]
New Agenda Item #7: **Fanno Creek Park & Plaza Master Plan Update combined with Plaza Location Study & Decision Process**

Important Discussion and/or Comments: Nachbar made a presentation using City consultant's (Walker Macy') presentation boards.

The first board was on *Existing Land Use*. There was discussion as to some of the different criteria for locating the plaza. Some of these could include factors from the TDIP. It was noted that redevelopment would need to be taken into consideration as well as the location in relation to commerce. Access was discussed as another consideration.

The next board was on *Environmental Considerations*: The 100 year flood plain was discussed and the fact that a large portion of the park (90% or more) is in this wetland or vegetated corridor area which essentially restricts what can be done with the land. Wetlands, and the fact that wetlands are defined by soil type and hydrology e.g. how much water does an area get – was discussed. It was noted that "vegetated corridors" are wetlands and it is regulated that within the corridor you must put native plants. One of the key issues will be how CWS views this. Are they strict? Not so strict?

Another board was on "*Vegetation Assessment*" – Tree canopies, good vegetated corridors, marginal & degraded – were discussed.

The next board was on "*Opportunities and Constraints*" which showed the following various types of development:
- No development
- wetlands
- very restricted development
- vegetated corridor
- semi-restricted development
- 100 year flood plain; and
- fully developable land

There was discussion about CWS "re-meandering" the creek. It was noted the creek is highly eroded, with key issues being erosion & back channels because of high velocity going thru there.

Brian Wegener, of Tualatin Riverkeepers, spoke about the impact of rushing water on the environment. He passed out some brochures on the subject.

The next board was on "*Access and Circulation*." - including:
- access points
- bike/pedestrian trails
- bike/pedestrian bridge
- street, and
- the vehicular bridge

Agenda Item #8 (moved from original Item #4): Report from Joint CCAC – Planning Subcommittee on Land-Use & Design Guidelines – Update

Important Discussion and/or Comments: Commissioners Potthoff and Craghead gave a synopsis on the training they received in Wilsonville the previous Friday on form-based code. They noted that form-based code and design regulations are not the same thing. They are a different way of 'attacking' the same problem. It's not an either/or thing. It's more a blending of the two. Most form-based code is hybrid.

Some of the notes taken regarding form-based code at that training session follow:

- Form-based code is more explicit than conventional codes.
- Form-based codes are excellent for facilitating transitions from one use to another.
- Rather than conventional codes – the focus is on the space in between the structures.
- A metaphor that resonated was that form-based code creates the room - not what goes on "the walls" of the room.
- Conventional codes rely heavily on zoning, resulting in a lack of flexibility.
- Every form-based code has what is called a "regulating plan" and that plan serves to replace the conventional code zoning. Most of these form-based codes are hybrids. A "pure" form-based code doesn't include land uses according to 'hard core' form-based theorists. There are no land uses – just talking about the form. A hybrid code is one that includes form-based codes to relate to the form of the buildings. Then conventional zoning is used to cover the use – hence the hybrid.
- The process of implementing a form-based code must address that lack of clarity creates uncertainty. That is, the public fears that there is going to be a loss of their identity and this fear needs to be addressed.
- The financial means and desire to invest in the area to which the form-based code will apply must be there.
- Provide flexibility, such as an alternative approval track.
- Provide flexibility to allow for changes in use.

Nachbar noted that the City consultant (Leland) supports form-based code because it gives some predictability to a developer to know there is going to be quality development.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): None

<u>**Agenda Item #9 (originally Item #7):**</u> **Engaging Downtown Property Owners/Businesses**

Important Discussion and/or Comments: Nachbar noted that on every 3rd Tuesday there would be an update with the chamber to keep people informed.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): None

<u>**Agenda Item #10 (originally Item #8):**</u> **Economic Development Position Recommendation**

Important Discussion and/or Comments: Nachbar lead the conversation by saying the following are some key things the Commissioners should consider before making recommendations:

- The function of economic development is inherently different from Downtown redevelopment. One seeks to address jobs, tax base, and retention of businesses,

while the other addresses redevelopment in the Downtown. It is not likely both goals can be successfully achieved considering the developing workload for Downtown.

- A policy with regard to economic development will be developed as part of the Comprehensive Plan development. This will provide analysis with regard to an economic development strategy and/or a future program. This would be reviewed by Council and the CCAC if so desired, and then form the basis for any later consideration of needed resources.
- The budget process will begin in January 2008, at which time a policy for economic development would likely be ready for discussion.
- Staff will include the CCAC in the policy development as it occurs.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): None

Agenda Item #11 (originally Item #9): Other Business/Announcements

Important Discussion and/or Comments: There was no further business and no announcements.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): Chair Switzer adjourned the meeting at 9:50pm.

_____
Doreen Laughlin, City Admin. Specialist II

ATTEST: _____
        Chairman Carl Switzer